DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 402 HE 000 999

Expanding Opportunities: Case Studies of Interinstitutional Cooperation, 1969.
Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
Spons Agency-Donner (William H.) Foundation.
Pub Date 69
Note-46p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.40
Descriptors-*Cooperative Programs, *Coordination, *Higher Education, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Negro Colleges, Negro Education

This report details the experiences of colleges in 5 cases of interinstitutional cooperation which hold the potential of becoming permanent and of contributing significantly to the expansion of higher educational opportunity for Negroes in the South. All the cases--Stetson University and Bethune-Cookman College; Bennett, Greensboro and Guilford Colleges; Catawba and Livingstone Colleges; the Texas Association of Developing Colleges; and LeMoyne and Owen Colleges--involve types of cooperation among liberal arts institutions in proximity to each other. Because the success of an interinstitutional program is affected by the procedures used in its formation, these case studies include descriptions of the procedures employed and candid analysis of some of the problems encountered. The cases demonstrate the feasibility and value of joint curricular offerings by traditionally Negro and white institutions, of shared library resources, instructional funds and administrative facilities, and the effective introduction of black studies into the curriculum. Evidence presented supports the continuation and expansion of such arrangements. (JS)

ED030402

EXPANDING OPPORTUNITIES

Case Studies of Interinstitutional Cooperation, 1969

Southern Regional Education Board / 130 Sixth Street, N.W. / Atlanta, Georgia 30313

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE000 999

FOREWORD

The Southern Regional Education Board's Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity was established in the spring of 1968 to spearhead a concerted regionwide effort to expand and improve post-high school education for Negroes.

From the outset, the institute has recognized the significant role which the traditionally Negro colleges can play in this effort, and that these institutions must be strengthened in order to meet their new and wide-ranging challenges. One major means of accomplishing these goals is for Negro colleges to cooperate with other nearby institutions, both predominantly white and black, to broaden and deepen their educational programs and services.

This report, prepared under the direction of the institute with the generous support of the William H. Donner Foundation, details the experiences of colleges in five cases of interinstitutional cooperation. These case studies are not presented as models to be imitated. Instead, they are intended as candid accounts of five approaches to cooperative endeavor, the difficulties involved, and the successes achieved.

SREB is pleased to publish these studies and hopeful that they will provide assistance, and perhaps inspiration, to universities and colleges which seek to improve Southern higher education through cooperation.

WINFRED L. GODWIN, Director
Southern Regional Education Board

CONTENTS

Introduction
James M. Godard..... 1

Bethune-Cookman College and
Stetson University: A Cooperative Course
Richard C. Langford..... 5

The Greensboro Tri-College Consortium
Frederic R. Crownfield..... 15

Livingstone-Catawba Cooperation
Frederic R. Crownfield..... 21

The Texas Association of Developing Colleges
Leander L. Boykin..... 29

The LeMoyne-Owen Merger
J. S. Anzalone..... 33

INTRODUCTION

Interinstitutional cooperation is increasingly recognized as a method by which institutions of higher learning may expand their services in providing educational opportunity and improve the quality of their educational offerings. Many patterns of cooperation have emerged. They may be formal or informal, temporary or permanent, geographically dispersed or concentrated, and composed of institutions with similar purposes or diverse programs. It is therefore not surprising that interinstitutional cooperation is one of the methods being adopted to improve and expand post high school educational opportunities for Negro youth.

New forms of cooperation are being developed between colleges which have historically served Negro students and nearby colleges which have primarily served white students. In many cases, the arrangements give indications of becoming permanent and growing in significance for each of the institutions. They constitute a move from the historic dualism in higher education to the idea of a single system. The benefits flow in both directions and are characterized by a sense of equal partnership. Above all, these arrangements provide a practical means of increasing educational opportunity in a setting which enhances mutual understanding.

A grant from the William H. Donner Foundation has made it possible to study cases of interinstitutional cooperation which hold the potential of becoming permanent and of contributing significantly to the goal of expanding higher educational opportunity for Negroes in the South. Five case studies are included in this publication. The institutions involved are all liberal arts colleges. A second series of case studies, to be published later, will include several large public universities. The central focus in all the reports is on types of cooperation among institutions in proximity to each other.

As the degree of success achieved in an interinstitutional program is affected by the procedures used in its formation and by a frank and continuing appraisal of results, these case studies include descriptions of the procedures employed and candid analyses of some of the problems encountered. The leadership of these colleges deserves high praise for its willingness to have these programs evaluated for the benefit of the higher education community.

When Dr. Paul Geren was inaugurated as president of Stetson University, he stated in his address that he expected his university and Bethune-Cookman College to establish some joint professorships. The seminar in social problems offered jointly by the two institutions is a first step in a long-range plan for increasingly close association.

Bennett, Greensboro and Guilford Colleges have many plans for cooperation in various stages of development. The implementation of cooperative programs is expected to move rapidly now that the colleges have appointed a full-time director.

Catawba and Livingstone Colleges now share a single department of sociology. While these colleges are cooperating in many ways, the most visible accomplishment, and perhaps the most significant up to this point, has been the merging of faculty and resources in this academic field.

Although the Texas Association of Developing Colleges is a consortium of traditionally Negro colleges, its program will include cooperative activities with traditionally white colleges and universities in the

same geographical area. This program is described at some length because the association is setting a pattern for several groups of traditionally Negro church-related colleges in other states.

The merger of LeMoyne and Owen Colleges in Memphis is an important story. LeMoyne College is related to the American Missionary Association and the United Church of Christ; Owen College was created by the Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention, a predominantly Negro church body. Both institutions made available their records, committee minutes and other information so that a detailed account of the merger process could be related.

The case studies were prepared after visits to the campuses and conversations with faculty and students as well as administrators. Those making the studies were Richard E. Langford, associate professor of English, Stetson University; Frederic R. Crownfield, director, Tri-College Consortium, Guilford College; Leander L. Boykin, professor of education, Florida A & M University; and J. S. Anzalone of the Southern Regional Education Board staff. The material was reviewed and organized into final form by the staff of the Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity, Southern Regional Education Board.

Van S. Allen, a new member of the institute staff, was asked to read the case studies and identify the major ideas he derived from them. As Dr. Allen had not been involved in the planning and visitations, he brought a fresh point of view to these reports. His brief statements, which follow, provide a meaningful preview of the value of these case studies.

1. These case studies have established the credibility and high potential of joint curricular offerings by traditionally Negro and white institutions in proximity to each other, potentials which go beyond mere exchange of faculty or students, such as:

   giving a course staffed with people from both institutions, enrolling students from both, and utilizing facilities and resources on the two campuses.

   creating joint professorships.

   creating a single academic department serving two institutions.

   providing a two-way flow of benefits and the experience of black and white students and faculty working together over an extended time period.

2. The development of administrators and of administrative procedures was effectively accomplished through sustained seminars and in-service training and through coordination and joint use of facilities.
3. Library resources were strengthened through cooperative and centralized purchasing and processing of books.
4. Even though two colleges are related to church bodies which have no historical relationships, the methods by which merger could be accomplished were effectively demonstrated.
5. Enriched offerings and maximum use of instructional funds may be attained through the sharing of faculty talents.
6. Through cooperation, students may be provided with a wider variety of educational choices.
7. Interinstitutional planning provides an unusual opportunity for the effective introduction of black culture into the curriculum.

Dr. Allen also summarized some of the factors which had caused difficulties:

1. the lack of full-time staff for planning and coordinating the consortium's program.
2. the absence of adequate transportation for students moving between campuses.
3. scheduling difficulties due to failure of the participating institutions to adopt a uniform calendar.

4. confusion in budget administration.
5. inadequate communication between participating institutions.
6. limited feedback to the several campuses about the program.
7. too few meetings for program planning and execution.
8. stumbling blocks arising from institutional and departmental self-interest.
9. limited funds for deriving full benefits from the program.
10. over commitment of personnel charged with carrying out the program.

In spite of the limitations, the evidence of success supports the continuation and expansion of the arrangements. The problems which were identified can be solved. The potential for each institution to be of larger service to education and the opportunity to illustrate in a most striking manner the working of the democratic processes between individuals and institutions were clearly demonstrated.

James M. Godard
Project Director
Institute for Higher
Educational Opportunity

BETHUNE-COOKMAN COLLEGE AND STETSON UNIVERSITY: A COOPERATIVE COURSE

by Richard E. Langford

Bethune-Cookman College is a traditionally Negro private college located at Daytona Beach, Florida, and Stetson University is a traditionally white institution 20 miles away at DeLand. President Paul Geren of Stetson University suggested a cooperative program in the following statement:

> The idea of the joint seminar is to multiply the resources and the sense of community which universities can bring to the study of social conflict. We are in the combination of a city and a town, Daytona Beach and DeLand; two educational institutions—Bethune-Cookman College and Stetson University—both desegregated, Bethune primarily Negro and Stetson predominantly white. We have civic members from both communities—municipal officials, school board members, professional persons, housewives. We include persons whose academic disciplines are sociology, economics, political science, education, law and the humanities. We have an array of social conflicts in mind: interracial, law enforcement, housing, juvenile problems, schools. The combination we are striving for is the view in depth from many perspectives. We hope to understand social conflict, including its complexity, difficulty, pervasiveness, and to develop some practical ideas for healing.

Dr. Geren met with Dr. Richard Moore, president of Bethune-Cookman College, to discuss the possibilities. The two presidents decided in the summer of 1968 to go ahead with plans for the course. They appointed co-directors to represent the two schools: Dr. John Hague, director of the Charles E. Merrill Program in American Studies, Stetson, and Dr. Florence Roane, director of the Division of Teacher Education, Bethune-Cookman.

In early discussions, the course was titled "Social Conflict in Volusia County," but it was changed to "Conflict in Contemporary Society," which expanded the scope of the course to include national and international issues. The co-directors met frequently to plan the course, select staff, and choose appropriate readings for the fall semester. A two-semester, two credit hour course was planned, American Studies 365-366 at Stetson, and Sociology 325-326 at Bethune-Cookman.

The co-directors formed a plan for the course: It would meet for two semesters, but either semester could be taken for college credit. The directors expected most participants to enroll for both semesters, fall 1968 and spring 1969, though they knew a few students would graduate at the end of the fall semester and not be able to enroll for spring. The concept of alienation in society, the socialization process, the economic and legal structure of society, class structures—these were some of the main areas with which the class would be concerned. Students would read background materials to help them form ideas and questions as they examined broad concepts.

The directors wanted to lead the students into a close examination of social conflict, hoping that such study and discussion might point to an understanding of how social conflict can be guided into constructive channels. It was hoped that the students might gain an understanding of social involvement and become interested in specific local efforts to better housing conditions, to improve health services, to alleviate environmental pollution, to improve financial and credit services to disadvantaged peoples, to promote voter registration, to expand

educational opportunities for more people, and so forth. The directors wanted the course to develop an awareness of the extent of social conflict and some of its disruptive consequences, and then to turn that awareness into specific local efforts to promote the general welfare of Volusia County residents. To prepare students to think eventually in terms of personal involvement, it was decided to assign background readings that would familiarize the students with basic psychological-sociological terminology and current writings in these areas. These readings included:

The Broken Image—Matson, Floyd W.
The Lonely Crowd—Riesman, David
The Child and Society—Elkin, Frederick
Childhood and Society—Erikson, Erik
People of Plenty—Potter, David
The Accidental Century—Harrington, Michael
Poverty in America—Gordon, Margaret S.
American Community Problems—Dentler, Robert
Problems of an Industrial Society—Faunce, William A.
Dilemmas in Criminology—Savitz, Leonard D.
A Minority Group in American Society—Yinger, J. Milton
The Slums: Challenge and Response—Hunter, David

The class was planned to meet twice a month during the fall semester and would alternate between Bethune-Cookman and Stetson. Stetson students would use their own cars to commute to Bethune-Cookman; the students would be reimbursed by Stetson for mileage. Bethune-Cookman students would be transported to Stetson in a college-owned bus. A class meeting time was set on Thursdays from 4:30 to 7:30 p.m. Students at both schools complete their regular daily class schedule by 4:30 p.m. and business and professional resource people would more likely be available.

Six discussion groups, each led by a faculty member from one of the participating schools were planned. They were to meet following an opening report or short lecture by staff or a resource person. Each group consisted of its two faculty leaders, four or five students from each college, and perhaps one or more community leaders or teachers (resource people).

Following a group discussion period, the entire class would adjourn at about 6 p.m. for dinner with each discussion group sitting as a unit so discussion of class material could continue. After dinner, the entire class would meet together for follow-up work, assignments, group reports and occasionally to hear a short presentation by another community leader on a special topic. Each school would act as host for the other making arrangements for meals and meeting places. The two schools agreed to pay a small stipend ($50.00) to resource people to cover their expenses and to pay $500.00 to members of their faculty acting as group leaders and staff, since the course was in addition to the regular teaching load.

The course enrolled 63 people; 28 students from Stetson, 20 from Bethune-Cookman, and 15 who took the course for college credit though they were not in college at the time (some teachers, some professional men and women from the two communities). With the faculty group leaders, resource people, and the co-directors there were 90 people directly involved in the course. The resource people included several ministers, an architect, two members of the Volusia County Human Relations Council, an attorney and others.

The course operates just about the way it was planned. There are varied presentations from community experts to encourage group discussion of local issues. On one occasion Ray Dunn, County Superintendent of Schools, spoke to the entire class about his ideas and plans for integrating all the public schools in the county next fall. Only partial integration has taken place up to now, and the county has operated on a "freedom of choice" plan for several years. Mr. Dunn offered a provocative and all-encompassing plan for school integration that will eventually mean many new school buildings, changing names and grade levels of several schools. He gave the class some idea of the effects such change will have on

the lives of teachers, students and parents in Volusia County. There will be other such presentations, perhaps from VISTA workers, Welfare Department officials, and from representatives of the Volusia County Health Center.

The co-directors meet regularly, between and after classes, to discuss progress, change plans as necessary, reassess assigned readings, prepare for class tests, etc. Drs. Roane and Hague frequently confer by telephone to ensure effective cooperation and direction of the course. There are regular staff meetings, sometimes while the students write a short test, or during the dinner hour.

The atmosphere at staff meetings seems to be relaxed and congenial. A number of questions come up: Can we arrange more time for group discussion? How can we manage to maintain continuity from fall through spring? Can we move more often from readings to practical work? How much reading—and what kind—shall we assign for spring? Will the emphasis of the course change? How will written tests be evaluated? What kind of final exam should be given? Can we make the dinner hour discussions more useful? The staff meetings have been conducted in a friendly fashion with free exchange between the staff members, and between the staff members and the co-directors.

At one general session a tape recording by Louis Lomax was played for the class. Mr. Lomax talked about his plan to break the cycle of continuous ghetto deprivation that spawned poor education and poverty; he suggested removing ghetto children from their parents so the children could be cared for properly, educated well, and indoctrinated into the mores of middle-class society. The students listened attentively; some nodded their heads in agreement, others frowned, and it was clear that they were vitally interested in what was being said. As soon as the tape was finished the class broke into its six discussion groups to talk about what they had heard.

The discussion leaders and the co-directors allow freedom to the groups to develop their own goals and projects. One group is working on a questionnaire to be used in a Volusia County integrated school. They will ask questions of social studies classes, such as: Do you think there is a difference between the effectiveness of black and white teachers? Is there favoritism shown toward either race? How do you personally feel about being in a mixed group? The questions are being refined with the help of a school principal in charge of social studies in a local school. He has given his permission for the group to work with social studies classes in his school. It is expected that other groups will originate and carry out special projects during the second semester of the course.

Written tests are given infrequently, only two in the first semester. One was a "take home" assignment that students were to work on out of class and bring to the next class meeting. Another was a one-hour in-class test concerning the readings, in which the students wrote on one of five discussion questions. There will be a final examination in-class, general enough in nature to permit most students to perform effectively.

There are a number of successful features of the course. First, the confrontation between black and white students and black and white faculty has been rewarding and revealing. As naive as it may sound, it has been surprising to many students, black and white, to discover that both races are made up of individual human beings, with individual personalities. One hears a white student say to a black, "That's funny, you have the same hang-up about written tests that I have." Then one watches the black student smile at the perplexed look on the face of the white; finally, recognition of the absurdity of stereotyped thinking dawns on both. Both races have begun to understand that all Negroes are not "black power" advocates, and all whites are not "Mr. Charleys."

This broadening and extension of interpersonal relationships is undoubtedly the most significant feature of the course, though this is a general value that might accrue from such associations under other circumstances. Specifically, in terms of this course, one of its successful features has been the dinner hour (though there are some disadvantages to it). Putting black and white students together in small groups at dining tables has resulted in effective social interaction. The students talk more easily at the dinner table and react more as individuals than they do at most other times.

Another successful feature of the course has been the involvement of the community resource people. Getting an architect to talk in specifics about low-cost housing, an attorney to comment on legal justice as it applies to disadvantaged peoples, a school teacher to talk about actual classroom work with poorly prepared children, a school superintendent to speak about the practical difficulties of ending a dual school system—all of this is very effective in scotching rumor, eliminating bad feeling and misunderstanding, and in getting blacks and whites to talk freely about facts. Some students have been pleasantly surprised to find that community officials and professional people really are sufficiently concerned to attend the classes and offer their services.

Another feature of the course that has worked successfully (again, with some drawbacks) is the alternation of meeting place, from the Bethune-Cookman to the Stetson campus, every other week. For many of the white students from Stetson, this has been the first time in their lives when they have stood in a cafeteria line composed mainly of black students; it is their initial taste of a social situation in which *they* are the minority group. For the first time, *they* are stared at and talked about as outsiders and interlopers. Consequently, some white students have gained some appreciation of the social situation by which the American Negro has been enveloped for centuries. It has been a sobering—and helpful—experience for many of the white students.

Another feature of the course that has been helpful is the bringing together of black and white community leaders. Such confrontations have led to an obvious increase in the regard and esteem which each race feels for the other. Still another successful feature, especially for the students, has been the course readings, though there are some difficulties with them which will be spoken of later. The readings have shown the students that interracial difficulties are neither new nor limited to this country—an important insight for most, since students often see such conflicts as only local or individual, and many times cannot view them in historical perspectives. The psychological-sociological orientation of the readings has helped many students in the course to break out of limited attitudes into broader, more widely directed thinking. One becomes certain of this as he talks with the students at dinner, between classes, and sits in on group discussions. Group leaders from both campuses have expressed similar opinions.

There have been some difficulties with the operation of the course. For instance, though there are obvious values in holding class sessions alternately on the two campuses, the distance between them seems to cause some unexpected absenteeism. On occasion, as many as one-third of the class are absent. There are undoubtedly a number of reasons why students and resource people miss too many classes such as sickness, business pressures and appointments, perhaps even some waning interest. The distance between the two campuses, however, is the major cause of the absenteeism.

Another somewhat troublesome feature is the dinner hour. Most participants think it is very helpful, but that too much class time is spent waiting in cafeteria lines. Some believe that it has changed in character from what it was in the beginning, an extension of class work, and is now merely a time-consuming

period of gossip and chatter. The discussion groups have not always been able to sit together, and that, too, has contributed to the now somewhat disorganized dinner hour.

The course readings have not been well received. The readings have been accepted better by the white students in the course than by the black ones, probably because many of the whites have had more experience with broad reading assignments. While the readings have generally been helpful, a few white students and many black ones resent them and think they are unnecessary. Bethune-Cookman students have also expressed concern about the cost of the assigned books; they are simply not as well prepared financially to participate in the course as are most Stetson students.

A source of some latent tension has arisen from the procedures used in administering the budget. In addition to the two people who are primarily responsible for teaching the course, some use is made of resource people from the communities and of some faculty from both institutions. Although their remuneration was included in the budget approved by both institutions and divisions of responsibility indicated and assumed for payment of these services, no plans were made for the time schedule to be followed in issuing the remuneration checks. One institution has not kept pace with the other one in issuing checks. It is apparent that a uniform time schedule for making payments should be adopted or one office should administer the total budget for the project.

Group discussions have not worked out as well as the co-directors thought they might. It has taken the students longer than expected to learn to trust each other. They still do not express themselves as freely as it was hoped they would. The difference in background, in general preparation, in reading and speaking abilities make some of the Bethune-Cookman students shy and insecure; many do not participate often in discussions. There is some (probably not a lot) of feeling that "the whites don't really mean it, anyway—they are just tossing us another bone." Such expressions of skepticism as this one probably arise from personal insecurities, and are often comforting rationalizations.

For some of the reasons already mentioned as well as for reasons not yet identified, there is a strong tendency for the Negro leaders to remain quiet. Whites do more of the talking. There is also a tendency, perhaps from habit, for discussion leaders to make little speeches instead of stimulating an exchange of ideas. Both black and white leaders do this, but the whites more often. Most teachers have little or no training that would enable them to perform well as discussion leaders. Most teachers are prepared to lecture, and that is what they do all too often when serving as discussion leaders.

Though the course is now several months old, a number of the old barriers of race are still evident. For instance, blacks and whites still sit separately, in little groups, whether in the large classroom situation, the smaller discussion groups, or at dining tables. It is not unusual to see blacks on one side of a dining table and whites on the other. Perhaps this feeling of difference will take much longer to dissipate. In any event, the students are genuinely interested, for the most part, in each other, and are sincerely concerned about what they are doing.

The co-directors have been a little surprised about the students' reactions to tests and grades. Many students have expressed their distaste for any kind of written test and some have suggested the course be graded only on a "pass-fail" basis, instead of on the letter grade basis used on the two campuses. Bethune-Cookman students have been especially fearful about these matters. At least half the students have said at one time or another that they really had not expected the course to be aimed quite so directly toward typical college study. They ex-

pected something new and unusual, even non-academic. Instead, they think they have merely taken on an extra course, in some respects.

There is a good deal of curiosity about, and interest in, the course on both campuses. The class was full shortly after it was announced. Despite the feeling some have that the course is not all they wanted or expected it to be, there is still an aura of uniqueness and special purpose about the group. Most faculty members see the course as something challenging, out of the ordinary, and as something necessary and long overdue. Generally, both Negro and white students are interested. Though given to some skepticism about the course, most seem to think it is worthwhile and that it can lead to further efforts in the same direction. One receives the impression that the students feel more keenly the desirability and value of the course than do some faculty. Several students have commented specifically on changes that have taken place in them; they feel an awareness and sensitivity about people, a new feeling for many, and they think they have undergone basic personality changes for the better. Nearly all the criticism voiced by the students has been healthy, and is intended to improve and maintain the course as a regular program. One hears no one say that the course is a failure; no one says it should be discontinued. Remarks generally seemed very objective.

Based primarily on the suggested outline for writing this report, a questionnaire was distributed to the students at a class meeting. Students were given time during the group discussion periods to answer the questions. A condensation of their answers, always using their own words, has been prepared and is included here. Not all students submitted the questionnaire, and some did not answer all the questions, but the condensation offered here is a valid cross-section of reactions to the course. Each of the following answers is from a different student:

Why are you enrolled in the course?

I wanted insight into Volusia County problems.
I wanted to do something constructive with my liberal education.
I was concerned about intolerance on both campuses.
I was worried about the human situation.
I teach in a low-income Negro school. I want help.
I am concerned about social and racial conflict.
I thought it would be interesting and helpful.
Because I was asked to enroll.
I want to understand the problems and try to solve them.
I want to find out what causes conflict and how to stop it.
I am concerned about conflict in communities.
It's my major field and it sounded attractively controversial.
I thought the course would help me in life.
I am narrow-minded and thought it might help broaden me.
As a Stetson student I want to know more about the county.
To give me a first look at people willing to talk about racial conflict.
I wanted to study first-hand social conflicts in Volusia County.
For professional improvement.
Because I thought I would get sociology credit for the course.
The course description led me to believe I'd learn about Volusia County.
I am interested in it as an educational experiment, biracial aspect.
I needed a two-hour course and thought it would be interesting.
Because of my interest in society.
To hear first hand what our social conflicts are all about.
To extend my knowledge of social conflict.
To try to understand race feelings.
To learn more about conflicts in our county, to contribute what I learn, and I need the hours.
Because I work with these problems at school.
To gain understanding as a teacher and learn how to communicate with black people.
The course title excited me.
For the exchange of ideas.
Looking for new ideas.

What is the most successful feature of it?

I am learning lessons in tolerance.
The group exchanges are beneficial and the reading discussions are helpful.
The exchange of campuses.

The interesting conversation.
The group discussions.
That the thing was done at all.
Meeting nice people and the communication between races. The lectures.
The group discussions.
The good general atmosphere and sincere interest.
The exchange of ideas between races, ages, professions.
The wide student variety.
The tolerance and understanding we seem to have of each other.
The chance to discuss conflicts openly.
The professional consultants.
Getting to know Bethune-Cookman students.
Discovering unique features of black and white students.
Hearing Volusia County speakers.
The main lectures.
The sustained interest.
Getting the students and faculty from the two schools together.
The give and take among students.
The fact that both races can discuss these problems intelligently.
The overall look at these problems.
Associating with a bi-racial group.
The assigned readings expanded by knowledge of sociology.
The exchange of ideas and exposure to current literature in the field.
The small seminar discussion groups.

What is the least successful feature of it?

Projects—lack of headway.
Haven't gotten beyond preliminary stages.
Bogged down in readings—too much reading.
Too much division of purpose—no time to do anything well.
Not enough time—superficial work.
Does not help me as a teacher.
Impractical—does not relate to specific problems.
The readings—and we don't meet often enough.
The irrelevant books we had to read.
The dinner discussions.
Books and discussions not correlated.
Dinner-table discussions.
The choice of reading material.
The readings don't relate with the course title.
Poor reading material.
The reading materials aren't pertinent.
Lack of information about grades.
Not enough discussion time.
Not enough time for the general sessions.
The grading system, disorganization, the readings.
Wastes too much time.
Wasted supper hour and inadequate talk - discussion time.
Group discussions—not relevant.
Becomes too social.
Lack of lectures on assigned readings.
The readings—too much.
Inadequate group discussion time.
Course not brought close enough to community problems.
The course organization is weak.
Too general—too abstract.
Insufficient continuity.

Compare your expectations with the actual experience: That is, did you expect it to be something it isn't? Explain briefly.

The course is more formally structured than I expected. I expected more independent work.
The course is more academic than I expected—more theoretical.
Expected more pertinent, lively discussion—got a lot of haggling over technical points and terms.
Thought there would be more special project work with findings presented to whole class.
Expected more emphasis on particular issues — more consideration of individual ideas of students.
Expected concrete, specific problems and solutions.
Expected less theory, more on local problems, less sociological talk.
Expected more discussion and activity with local problems.
Expected it to deal with local issues and conflict, and it doesn't.
Expected more in-depth lectures—more discussion—expected to discuss the readings more.
Expected specific issues to be broached and discussed, with answers from authorities.
Expected to work on local problems.
Expected more stimulating reading, but got dry data.
Expected specific conflicts in the two schools to be discussed.
Expected more debate and discussion.
Expected the people and the problems to correlate with the text. They haven't.

I did not expect to see students from the two schools work so well together.
Expected more face-to-face contact with poverty and discrimination problems.
Expected more pertinent, less expensive, reading material. I expected less emphasis on tests and grades.
Expected more concern with actual problems of Volusia County.
Expected more actual interracial discussion and exchange.
Expected it to deal more specifically with real social problems.
Expected more lectures from people in conflict areas (law, police, welfare, etc.) and more on non-racial conflict.
Expected more field trips.
Expected more speakers from differing cultural backgrounds.
Expected more discussion of county conflict.
Expected to talk about practical problems of the community.
Expected to be involved in projects in conflict.
Expected more realistic treatment of social problems in Volusia County.

How would you change the course?

Pursue individual projects in detail, in small groups.
Change books, don't use *Broken Image.*
Get better, more provocative books.
More time in small groups—no tests.
No tests—let each group go its own way—less emphasis on background readings.
Better organized discussion groups.
Meet more often, waste less time eating and waiting to eat, more definite purpose, less theoretical readings.
Give three hours academic credit, meet every week, eliminate the dinner hour, divide group into subject areas and give us a choice.
More local issues, more credit, meet more often, offer field work, and eliminate written tests.
Give the course a more formal format, clearer direction.
Change the format.
Better reading selections.
Eat first—then work for most of the time.
Let students select the readings.
Change the readings, put in field work.
Better books, more direct study of our county.
Eliminate grades.
More field work.
Get more involved with actual problems.
Use pass-fail basis for grades, change the readings.
Choose books directly related to Volusia County problems and do more field work.
Meet more often, eliminate dinner hour.
Change the name of the course, or the material, to fit what's going on.
More discussion of actual problems.
Get in more speakers who know conflict first hand.
Field trips, more community speakers, eliminate exams, have students write short papers and present them to the class.
Let Stetson and Bethune-Cookman meet at their own schools.
More practice and less theory—more community problems.
Read less widely and more deeply, allow more time for discussion of speakers' ideas.
Relate readings to class discussions, outline the course more clearly, involve students more in papers, reports, projects.
Engage in field activities and projects.

Do you have a special criticism about the operation of the course? If so, what?

Course should be offered only on a pass-fail basis—no tests, no grades—should not take time for tests.
Course seems disorganized.
Course is too academic—needs more action.
The discussions are too abstract.
We waste too much time, disorganized, no clear purpose.
The course is insufficiently organized.
The reading materials are irrelevant.
The lectures and discussions are not correlated, the books are poor.
It's a good course but I can't keep up with the reading.
Too much time wasted eating—not enough discussions.
Dinner discussions need more direction.
More large group lectures are needed. We need more interaction between groups.
There is too much time lost in traveling and eating. The course should be oriented to social conflicts in actual race relations or should be academically oriented—not both.
The direction is chaotic and disorganized.
We don't meet often enough.
Community resource people are not included sufficiently.

The co-directors are aware that changes need to be made in the course. Goals need to be reexamined, for one thing; both faculty and students have indicated that they would like a clearer understanding of the purposes of the course, and would like the objectives spelled out. These problems were discussed and changes made for the spring term.

There may be too many students in the course. With a smaller class, it would be possible to know the students better, and for the students to know each other better. With fewer students, less money would be needed to carry on the course, and fewer logistical problems would be involved (feeding, transportation, etc.).

The class probably should be removed from the academic atmosphere, if possible. Perhaps meetings (with fewer students) could be held in private homes, alternating from Negro to white. A few meetings could be held on campus so that the values of experiencing those different milieu would not be lost.

It would be advantageous to obtain outside financial support for the class, perhaps from local civic and community clubs representing the two communities involved. Outside financing, for books, meals, stipends, transportation, would remove a major handicap under which the course now works. All students and staff would then feel treated equally well.

Training sessions with staff and resource people before beginning the subsequent terms would be helpful. Course objectives should be stated clearly. Training should be given to discussion leaders in how to stimulate student talk and promote active student participation.

The students need help to develop specific projects and to be involved personally in direct efforts to reduce social conflict. Seeing a venereal disease center in operation, talking with some parole officers, acting as poll watchers on election day, working for a while in a welfare office, visiting families in poverty areas, teaching disadvantaged children, learning about personal loans and credit problems, observing a school psychologist test a disturbed child—these are a few of the many areas in which students could work to learn at first hand about the causes of social conflict.

Staff members should be watched carefully for signs of disinterest or personal insecurity. One weak group leader, who appears to condescend or who lectures his group about his own convictions, can do severe harm to the program. The co-directors must have the authority and the willingness to change the staff as necessary, to ensure the best progress for the entire program.

The outside readings should be reduced in scope during the subsequent terms. The co-directors have indicated already that this will be done. The staff knows that too much reading was assigned in the beginning, and that a good deal of course time has been spent in preparatory, background readings.

The dinner hour has become a problem. It takes too much time from the group discussions and some change is needed as soon as possible. One suggestion is that eating dinner simply be eliminated; but there are definite values in it continuing. Possibly dinner could be eaten before or after class. Or the two schools could provide box suppers for everyone, which would save all the time spent getting to and from cafeterias and standing in long lines. Ninety people is a large group to handle for dinner, giving another reason to reduce the size of the class.

The class should meet more often. Instead of just seven or eight meetings a semester there should be at least ten to twelve. With more meetings, continuity and interest can be sustained more effectively. It would be simpler to plan more meetings were the class smaller.

For a beginning the course was too broadly designed and tried to accomplish too much. Limitation of objectives, class size and readings would have gained unity of purpose and quicker response to problems

as they arose. Perhaps the original idea of the course was a better one; had the course dealt with problems of social conflict in Volusia County, as first planned, then many of the criticisms voiced by students might not have arisen.

There is much about this first effort to commend it. It is a beginning, and a sincere and helpful one, in most respects. It has already been a worthwhile learning experience for most participants, staff and students alike, and the fact that the course will be changed, improved, and continued for another term speaks well for those who have planned and carried it out. The co-directors, Dr. John Hague and Dr. Florence Roane, have invested much personal energy and thoughtful, effective concern into the overall success of the course; and both expect it, or variations of it, to be a part of the course offerings of Stetson University and Bethune-Cookman College in the future.

THE GREENSBORO TRI-COLLEGE CONSORTIUM

by Frederic R. Crownfield

The Greensboro Tri-College Consortium has been a response to an obvious need, and seems to have developed in such a natural way that it is hard to recover in detail the process by which it came into being. That each of the three colleges has had a new president since 1964 has perhaps helped open the way at the same time that it has obscured any clear steps in the early development.

ORIGIN AND PURPOSE

Dr. J. Ralph Jolly became president of Greensboro College in 1964, Dr. Grimsley T. Hobbs became president of Guilford College in 1965, and Dr. Isaac H. Miller, Jr. became president of Bennett College in 1966. Dr. Hobbs, coming to Guilford from the faculty of Earlham College which was engaged in several cooperative arrangements, was interested from the first in bringing Guilford into such a relationship. He found Dr. Jolly also interested and when Dr. Miller came he was quickly drawn in.

In 1967 Greensboro College, as the coordinating institution, received a grant under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 for a curriculum study which made it possible to bring a number of consultants on various phases of curriculum development to the campus for meetings. Faculty from the other colleges were invited to these sessions. There was another grant of $10,000 from the same source which made it possible to explore the opportunities for closer cooperation between the three. It provided for the salary of a part-time director, a part-time secretary, and office expenses.

When these grants were received, the three presidents with their deans held several meetings and in August, 1967, agreed on the appointment of Dr. Frederic R. Crownfield, Craven professor of religion and chairman of the department at Guilford College, as director of the study. Dr. Crownfield served on a half-time basis until January, 1969, when he became full-time director.

The consortium is a direct response to the problems which are now facing small, private liberal arts colleges. It seeks on the one hand to reduce operating expenses and, on the other, to provide a richer program. The first will be accomplished in such ways as: the elimination of unnecessary duplication of small classes; improved library operations; and in the operation of a joint summer school. As for the enrichment, this will come about as unnecessary duplications are eliminated, thus freeing faculty to give courses which could not otherwise be offered, and as the needs of all of the institutions are considered in appointing new faculty. In general the purpose is to allow each college to perform more adequately the task it envisions for itself, without losing its unique individuality.

RESULTS

The three colleges are located within a few miles of one another. Bennett College is on the eastern side of the city of Greensboro; Greensboro College is close to the center of the city; Guilford College is on the western edge of the city, but also has a downtown campus contiguous to Greensboro College.

All are well established, with a history dating back before 1900. Bennett, originally coeducational, has been a woman's college since 1926, primarily for Negroes. Greensboro College, beginning as a wom-

an's college, became coeducational in 1954. Guilford has been coeducational from its beginning in 1837. All three are liberal arts, church-related colleges, though none is closely church controlled.

There had been very limited, informal cooperation in the past, but after the year of study and planning cooperation is now entering a new phase.

During the academic year 1967-68 many conferences were held, participated in by most of the departments of the three colleges. Course offerings were compared and reviewed for the purpose of discovering unnecessary duplication of small classes, the recognition of strengths and weaknesses, and the possibilities of enriching the list of available course offerings by taking advantage of the special competence of various faculty members. These meetings consumed a great deal of time, but they have led not only to some specific proposals, but to mutual understanding and respect. Also working to this latter end has been a two-day faculty colloquium involving 30 to 40 faculty members from the three colleges; plans are being made for another meeting this year. In addition, the three colleges held a joint faculty meeting at the beginning of the present academic year (1968-69). A report on the status of the consortium and an address by Lewis B. Mayhew on the whole situation with regard to cooperative arrangements between colleges, highlighted the meeting which was followed by a social gathering.

During the current year interchange of students has been broadened, though it has been hampered by lack of adequate transportation between the institutions. In the first semester 50 students registered in a total of 55 courses at a college different from that in which they were registered. Courses taken at Guilford College include business management, chemistry, computer mathematics, French, Italian, personal hygiene, physics, political science, psychology, sociology and Spanish. At Greensboro College students from the other two colleges are taking courses in art, anthropology, education (including special education), English, French, philosophy and religion. Courses in French, education and special education are being taken at Bennett College. It seems to be a result of the transportation problem that no Bennett students are taking courses at Guilford, and no Guilford students are taking courses at Bennett.

In a quite different area, the three colleges—with funds supplied in part from a Title III Grant—have cooperated in bringing a number of outstanding speakers to the three campuses. These include Dr. Albert Hibbs, senior space scientist of NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory; Dr. Jordan Kurland, expert on Russian history and far eastern affairs; Dr. William Edgerton, professor of Slavic languages and literature at Indiana University; Dr. Frank Golley, professor of ecology at the University of Georgia and director of research at the Savannah River Project; Dr. E. O. Wilson, professor of zoology at Harvard; and Dr. Henri Peyre, chairman of the department of French at Yale.

There has also been some sharing of faculty. For three years Bennett and Guilford have jointly employed a faculty member in art. At present a member of the mathematics department at Bennett is teaching a Guilford course on digital computers. In the second semester a Greensboro College faculty member will offer a course in international relations at Guilford, while a member of Guilford's faculty will give a course on state government at Greensboro College.

LIBRARY COOPERATION

A most important possibility for cooperation is in the area of library services. The consortium has secured a consultant in this area. It seems clear that there are definite advantages to be gained from a single technical processing center and from a program of shared acquisitions. The latter should be based on the establishment by a competent bibliographer of a basic list of books to be held at each

college. It is expected that such a list would have value beyond local use. In addition, each college will agree on certain areas of specialization correlated with areas in which it is prepared to offer advanced instruction, and will build a strong collection in that area. This will have special value in the acquisition of technical journals and other serials. Other possibilities include the employment, for a limited period, of several experts in such fields as acquisitions, processing, circulation, and business and budget, who will be able to work with each of the libraries to improve their services in these departments. In connection with this the consultant also suggests temporary interchange of personnel, both for training and familiarization with the other libraries involved. Herbert Poole, librarian of Guilford College, has been released to give three-fourths of his time to directing this project.

JOINT SUMMER SCHOOL AND OTHER AREAS

Heretofore, Guilford and Greensboro have operated separate summer schools, with 200-300 students each. Academic offerings have generally been limited to basic courses. It is expected that there will be some financial advantage in one operation rather than two and, even more important, it should be possible to offer a more varied program than either has been able to offer in the past.

A beginning has been made in bringing the development officers of the three colleges together to consider possibilities of some joint efforts in the field of fund raising, including funds for the administration of the consortium.

All of the colleges accept, and in fact deliberately recruit, culturally disadvantaged students. All recognize an obligation to give extra help to students whose performance is below conventional standards, but who seem to have real potential for growth. It is proposed that this effort be handled through the consortium.

ADMINISTRATION

So far there has been no effort to set up an elaborate structure. The presidents of the three colleges meet about once a month. Frequently the deans meet with them, and also meet separately. The director is responsible for the execution of the policy decisions made by these groups. Primarily his function is to discover possibilities and promote cooperation in as many ways as possible—in curriculum development, faculty development, administrative improvement, and improved student services.

Reference has already been made to the conferences of faculty in various disciplines to discover the most effective ways to use available faculty. Another effort in this direction is the formation of an Advisory Curriculum Committee, composed of the three academic deans and three members from each college representing in each case the humanities, natural sciences and social sciences. All proposed curriculum changes will be reported to this committee for discussion concerning interinstitutional needs, and for appropriate recommendations. It is understood, however, that this committee has no power to dictate to any of the colleges with respect to curricular modifications, but it at least assures that proposals for modification will be looked at in relation to the whole situation.

This committee will also study and make recommendations as to areas in which the several colleges should develop advanced major programs. Other recommendations might involve the development of certain academic disciplines at one college, while another develops other specialities in order to provide a mutually supportive interinstitutional program. The sciences offer an obvious area for such cooperation.

A student registers for all courses in his home campus, clearing with both deans to make sure that the course he proposes to take will be acceptable for the purpose for which he takes it and to prevent

overcrowding of classes at the other college.* As it has operated, these approvals have been routine, but it is felt that there should be some safeguard against possible contingencies.

When a student takes a course at another college his own college is billed at the regular charge per credit hour (approximately the same among the three). There is no extra charge to the student except for special fees (such as lab fees) charged all students who take the course.

When a student completes a course his grade is reported directly to his own college and is entered on his permanent record like any other course and is counted in calculating academic averages. It is not treated as transferred credit.

An obvious necessity if students are to take courses freely on other campuses is correlation of calendars and schedules. At present the calendars are not exactly the same, but there are no serious differences. As for schedules, Bennett and Guilford at the east and west extremes operate classes on the hour, while Greensboro College and the Guilford downtown campus operate on the half hour, minimizing the time lost when one takes a class on another campus. Greensboro College and the downtown campus of Guilford are easily accessible to one another.

PROBLEMS

Cooperation has been well received. Decisions have been made by general agreement rather than by majority vote. It has been well supported by the administrations of all three colleges, and they look to the consortium as a permanent arrangement. Faculty have, with few exceptions, been interested in and even excited by the possibilities. Students seem generally satisfied with the courses offered, and are becoming increasingly aware of the opportunities available through the other colleges.

At present the most difficult problem is communication between campuses. There is the physical problem of getting from one to the other and there is the time lost in moving from one campus to another. Consultation on scheduling may help to reduce effects of the latter, but transportation has proved difficult to arrange. Student possession of cars is restricted by all three colleges, public transportation is quite inadequate, and hired transportation is very expensive, with no obvious source of funding. Solutions are being sought.

Another quite different problem is the tendency to talk at length of interesting possibilities about which nothing is ever done. This is perhaps natural, since department chairmen already have their hands full, and no one of them has any authority over the others. At present the obvious person to be responsible is the director, but it is possible that the department heads in various areas could choose one of their number to act as chairman. The choice would seem to be, as it so often is among institutions, between democracy and efficiency.

Different departments vary in their attitudes toward the corresponding departments in the other two colleges. This was particularly noticeable at first in respect to the sciences and music, but there has been a noticeable improvement as the members of the departments have come to know one another. It was surprising to discover how little communication there had been between the faculties in the past. A number of faculty met for the first time at one of the meetings of their three departments.

Some faculty members understandably feel threatened by the consortium, seeing in it a device for eliminating some of them. Actually these teachers are generally the ones who teach large sections of subjects like the beginning and intermediate lan-

*This is to make sure that a course a student thinks is equivalent to one in his own college really is equivalent. It is not intended to allow a department to refuse recognition to comparable courses at another institution.

guages, English composition and general education courses which will always need about the same total number of sections and therefore the same number of teachers. There is, however, more of a problem with regard to the joint summer school, where it seems likely that some who would like to teach will not be needed.

It seems clear that, as the operation of the consortium has developed, there will continue to be need for an overall administrative staff. There is of course the tendency for such things to continue to expand until they get out of proportion, and this must be carefully watched. But even though the administrative machinery is kept to a minimum, there remains the problem of financing it on a stable basis.

FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

The possibilities for the future seem endless. Among the three colleges an excellent program for the education of science teachers for secondary schools could be developed. There is a pressing need for such teachers, and it would seem as if this might be an area which could be explored by the consortium.

Still in the area of teacher training, all the indications are that North Carolina may include public kindergartens in its educational system. Bennett College has a program now for kindergarten teachers.

With current interest in African and Afro-American Studies, this is an obvious area for cooperation within the consortium, especially when the interest in the subject matter is combined with the feeling that such courses ought to be taught by black instructors. As administrators know very well, though students are reluctant to believe it, there just are not enough of these teachers to go around, and those who are really competent can command salaries in a higher range than those paid to the rest of the faculty of most small colleges.

Both Bennett and Guilford are faced with requests or demands for courses in black studies and efforts are being made to meet them. During the second semester of the current academic year, 16 students from Guilford (men and women of both races) are taking a course at Bennett dealing with the Negro in American life and culture. The request for an Afro-American history course next year at Guilford, taught by a black professor, is being met by negotiations with Bennett for one of their faculty, either on an exchange basis or by separate contract. As transportation becomes available, other courses may be taken at Bennett. Guilford is attempting to get a black faculty member in one of its strong departments and, if successful, this could help meet some of Bennett's needs.

In the area of library cooperation a consultant is to be engaged to draw up a basic list of books on black history and culture, and funding is being sought. This collection would be at Bennett, but under recently concluded agreements, they will be available to faculty and students throughout the consortium.

In the joint summer school there will be a course, regularly given at Bennett, dealing with the teaching of culturally disadvantaged students.

Apart from the content of the educational program, there are other possibilities where cooperation could be advantageous, but in which there is little interest at present. These include a single system of student records and registration, based on use of a computer; computerized accounting; joint fund-raising (e.g. National Science Foundation funding for joint science programs); cooperation in recruiting and admitting students.

A proposal on which there is already tentative agreement calls for catalogs which would have a listing of all courses available in all three institutions, with separate information on each college, stating its educational philosophy, personnel, requirements for admission, fees and so on.

CONCLUSION

At this point, the consortium is well under way. Some opportunities are clear, some problems have been solved, but both problems and opportunities will doubtless continue to present themselves. What will eventually develop remains to be seen, but those who are concerned with cooperation are optimistic about the future.

LIVINGSTONE-CATAWBA COOPERATION

by Frederic R. Crownfield

By mutual agreement entered into about five years ago, Livingstone College and Catawba College in Salisbury, N. C., have been cooperating in several ways. The initiative for this came from the presidents of the two colleges in order to promote greater and more effective use of available facilities.

GENERAL EFFORTS

1. Interchange of Classes.

   The first step was the mutual agreement that any course being given in either college and needed by a student in the other college, could be taken by the student. There would be no interchange of funds and grades would be reported directly to, and recorded by the college in which the student was registered.

   This possibility seems in actuality to have been used only occasionally. Exact figures are not available but apparently not more than six students have made use of it during the five years it has been in effect. It would seem that a few more Livingstone students have taken courses at Catawba than in the other direction, but there has been interchange in both directions.

   The provision is still in effect, though neither college catalog (Livingstone, 1967-68; Catawba, 1968-69) mentions the agreement.

2. Libraries.

   Students from either college may freely borrow books at the other library and make use of reading rooms and reference materials. Until recently, an appreciable number of Livingstone students have used the Catawba library as a place of study. This has declined since better facilities have become available at Livingstone.

3. Developing Colleges Legislation.

   The two colleges have availed themselves of the opportunities provided by Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen their programs in art and music. George Washington University is the assisting institution. Catawba College acts as the fiscal agent of the program, and associate professor Honaker of the department of drama and speech at Catawba is the director of the program.

   Through National Teaching Fellowships, with stipends supplemented by funds from the two colleges, each has been able to employ a teacher of art. In addition, Livingstone has a teacher of music. Both colleges have found this has improved their programs. Livingstone especially sees it as having strengthened one of their weakest areas. There has been no interchange of students in these courses though it would not be impossible.

JOINT SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT

The outstanding achievement in cooperation between these two colleges has been the formation of a joint sociology department.

The background of this was a joint program in community development which began in the fall semester of 1967. Dr. Paul C. Heckert, the chairman of the sociology department at Catawba, had served during the summer of 1966 as a faculty intern with the North Carolina Fund, and had become aware of the severe shortage of trained personnel in the field of

community development. Both Catawba and Livingstone needed additional staff in sociology. The Piedmont University Center, under the direction of Dr. Paul Marrotte, was eager to promote cooperation between member colleges, and the North Carolina Fund became interested in supporting this sort of work. The result was an agreement by which Dr. Sterling Whitener was employed in the name of the Piedmont University Center, which acted as fiscal agent for the arrangement. A $9,000 grant from the North Carolina Fund, supplemented by financial and service support from Catawba and Livingstone, finalized the agreement. Dr. Whitener served as director of the community development program and had a full faculty status at both institutions.

Under this arrangement Dr. Whitener offered a three credit hour course in community work theory during the first semester of 1967-68, supplemented by a biweekly "sensitivity lab." This has been described as a "group process of learning to understand and communicate at deeper levels than usual, about life, about oneself, and others in a group." Twelve students from both colleges were enrolled with classes held on both campuses.

In the spring semester, each of these students was placed with one of several social agencies for eight hours work per week (actually they often gave more). They also participated in a seminar dealing with a number of specific community agencies and how they operated in the Salisbury-Rowan area. Students also shared the problems which arose in their work.

Although the students frequently felt that their accomplishments fell short of their hopes, the project was considered highly successful. During the summer of 1968, aided by a further grant of $15,000 from the North Carolina Fund, 15 students (ten from Livingstone and five from Catawba) were placed with a number of community agencies. These included the police department, Veterans' hospital, recreation department, work with elderly people, and several agencies under the Salisbury-Rowan Community Service Council. There was an initial period of training and a continuing seminar. The participating students were paid for their work and received two semester hours credit.

The integrated classes brought no serious problems on either campus or in the community. The general student reaction seems to have been favorable.

The success of this project led to the proposal that the two colleges establish a combined sociology department, completely integrated in curriculum, faculty and student body. By this means it would be possible to have one strong department, with a variety of specializations and an adequate salary scale. It was also believed that such a project would attract foundation funds.

Dr. William Reeder of Cornell University and Dr. Mereb Mossman of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro served as consultants in setting up the program. It was agreed that there should be two major areas of concentration: general sociology, which would prepare for graduate work in this discipline, and development sociology, leading either to a terminal program or to advanced work in the human services, with special emphasis on community or regional development.

> As currently envisaged the curriculum would consist of three categories of courses. The first category will include the basic courses required of all sociology majors. These courses will be designated as lecture courses to handle large numbers of students. It is in this category that the most efficient use of teaching personnel can be realized. The second category will include skills and methods courses such as counselling, field work seminars, and organizational techniques. These courses will of necessity be taught in small sections to provide individualized instruction. By drawing students from both colleges, sections should at all times be kept at the optimum number. The third category will include elective enrichment courses taught on an alternate year basis as student demands and teaching resources allow.*
>
> *Quoted from *Proposal for a Joint Department of Sociology: Catawba College and Livingstone College. (1968)*

The faculty is as follows:

Paul C. Heckert, chairman
Sterling H. Whitener
Kenneth D. Sell
Aziz D. Pabaney
Ralph R. Speas

One faculty member teaches in the joint program and is listed only on the Livingstone faculty.

Livingstone College has over 200 sociology majors; Catawba, over 50. However, about half of the Livingstone majors are freshmen, of whom approximately one-third drop out before the sophomore year. Few change to another major. At Catawba, majors are not chosen until the sophomore year. The basic course is given this year on the Livingstone campus with about 150 students, and operates with large lectures and small discussion sections. Classes are held at Catawba on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and at Livingstone on Tuesdays and Thursdays, with 75 minute sessions. Students are transported from one school to the other by means of buses supplied by the local transportation company. Some are driven by students, others by regular bus drivers. This has been found to be expensive, but there seems to be no alternative. At present this is being funded by the Southern Education Foundation.

In general, there has been acceptance and approval of the program by faculty, students and the local community.

Among the Catawba faculty there has been some feeling that Livingstone standards were lower than their own. Faculty at both institutions are aware that salaries in the joint department are higher than the average, not only because of the double source, but also because of the special funding. This is especially true at Livingstone, and some faculty there feel threatened and are opposed to the arrangement. However, these are a minority. At Catawba such feeling is even less. On the other hand, faculty on joint appointment who were originally from Catawba are not entirely happy with the fact that on the faculty list in the Livingstone catalog, they appear as "part-time" faculty. Presumably this is because counting them as full-time faculty would depress the average salary scale at Livingstone. Among the Catawba faculty there was some opposition on racial grounds, but there is no indication that this was an issue either in arriving at the decision to merge the departments, or subsequently. Catawba faculty complain of lack of adequate office space at Livingstone, though there is no feeling that this is due to any discrimination.

The racially integrated program seems to present no problem to students. Catawba students speak highly of the program. There is some criticism of one of the teachers, but it was stated that there had been improvement as the course developed. There has been some resentment among Livingstone students who felt they were at a disadvantage because of previous lower standards in their department. In some cases there was a tendency to blame inferior grades on discrimination.

At the conclusion of a survey of social welfare courses, an evaluation sheet was passed out. The class included 33 Livingstone students and 28 Catawba students. To the question "Do you think that Livingstone and Catawba colleges should continue or cancel this joint program?" 59 replies were favorable. Of the 59 favorable replies, 50 gave reasons, such as recognition of the greater strength of the joint department, enjoyment of the competition, the making of new friends, the help it gave in breaking down racial barriers in a real situation, the improvement of standards.

The strongest negative reaction seems to have been evoked by a matter which hardly touched any point essential to the program. This was the adjustment of the two calendars at Thanksgiving. Catawba's calendar, adopted several years ahead, provided

for a holiday on Thursday only, while Livingstone's calendar had regularly scheduled a week-end holiday. When Livingstone accepted the Catawba calendar there was some protest, which was of no avail.

Although Salisbury is in an area where there is commonly believed to be considerable racism, the joint department seems to have been generally well accepted. The Community Development Program, working with welfare agencies, schools, law enforcement agencies, and in other ways, has not been hampered and is being continued. That this is so is a tribute to the planning and conduct of the program. To the question whether there was any immediate prospect of an extension of this idea to other areas, there were conflicting answers. At Livingstone the answer was "yes"; at Catawba "no," though it was stated that some departments had expressed interest in the possibility. The seemingly contradictory answers can be reconciled if it is understood that Livingstone's affirmative reflected the interest which had been expressed, while Catawba's negative reflected the fact that no specific proposals were under consideration at the time. Not all problems have been solved, but a significant enterprise seems to be off to an excellent start.

THE TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF DEVELOPING COLLEGES

by Leander L. Boykin

The Texas Association of Developing Colleges is a nonprofit consortium of privately supported institutions serving predominantly Negro student bodies. The six participating colleges comprising the association at the present time are:

Bishop College, Dallas
M. K. Curry, Jr., president
Huston-Tillotson College, Austin
John T. King, president
Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins
J. O. Perpener, president
Paul Quinn College, Waco
L. H. McCloney, president
Texas College, Tyler
Allen C. Hancock, president
Wiley College, Marshall
T. W. Cole, Sr., president

The charter of the association makes provision for admitting other colleges if they meet the definition of a "developing college" as set forth in Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, "Strengthening Developing Institutions." The act defines a developing institution as "one that . . . is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching, administrative staffs and of its student services; and is, for financial or other reasons, struggling for survival and is isolated from the main currents of academic life. . . ."

The stimulus for the formation of the association came from discussions between representatives of the Committee on Higher Education Among Negroes of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., and representatives of a special projects in education group established by the Ford Foundation to work in the field of the predominantly Negro colleges. As a result of these discussions, the Committee on Higher Education Among Negroes prepared a position paper entitled "Prospects for Change: Predominantly Negro Colleges in the South." Dr. William B. Rogers, staff executive of the Committee on Higher Education Among Negroes, was the author of the paper.

On November 2, 1966, Dr. Rogers of the United Board for College Development of the National Council of Churches invited the presidents of a number of predominantly Negro colleges in Texas, the presidents of Southern Methodist University, North Texas State University, Texas Christian University, and Austin College to meet at Southern Methodist University to explore the possibilities of cooperative action among the colleges and universities. President Milton T. Curry of Bishop College presided at this first meeting.

The conclusion was readily reached by the assembled presidents that a cooperative structure would indeed be feasible in Texas. Two weeks later on November 17, 1966, the Texas Association of Developing Colleges was organized on an informal basis with the presidents or representatives of the six predominantly Negro colleges in attendance.

Carl F. Parker of Austin College was asked to become its part-time coordinator-consultant, with his first task being the preparation of a Title III proposal. The first meeting of the association was held at Southern Methodist University on December 6, 1966. The main business of this meeting was to discuss a proposed application under Title III of the

Higher Education Act of 1965, and the drafting of a constitution and by-laws for the association.

The coordinator-consultant had prepared a list of 27 possible projects for consideration. Agreement was reached that a Title III application should be prepared covering 11 of the projects. The coordinator-consultant was authorized and directed to proceed with its preparation against the deadline of December 15, 1966.

Approval was given to a proposed draft of a Constitution and By-Laws which had been prepared by President Perpener and President Savage.

A Title III application was prepared by the coordinator-consultant requesting $941,328 in federal funds and showing a total of $145,200 in non-federal funds to be provided by the colleges or secured from other sources.

At the meeting on November 17, 1966 and the subsequent meeting on December 6, 1966, approval was given to a budget covering various programs and administrative operation. This budget was based on payment of fees by member colleges, anticipated grants from foundations, and funds from Title III of the Higher Education Act.

Since the Texas Association had moved so decisively and so promptly, on February 19, 1967 a joint application was submitted by the Texas Association and the United Board for College Development to the Ford Foundation for a grant to subsidize the staffing and administration of the association as a prototype consortium for predominantly Negro church related colleges in the South.

On May 1, 1967, the association was formally incorporated as a non-profit educational association under the Non-Profit Corporation Act of Texas, with the presidents of the six colleges as the Board of Trustees. President T. Winston Cole, Sr. of Wiley College served as its first permanent chairman.

On July 7, 1967 the Ford Foundation announced a grant of $120,000 to the United Board, and to the Texas Association of Developing Colleges, on a 50-50 "matching basis" with the participating institutions over a three-year period, 1967-70. The grant was in support of the administrative operation of the association. This grant was made after a careful evaluation of the desire of the participating colleges to work together in cooperative programs and of the potential of these programs for strengthening and developing the institutions.

On June 26, 1967, the board of the association invited Dr. William B. Rogers and Dr. Carl F. Parker to become president and vice president, respectively. Dr. Parker became the vice president that day with Dr. Rogers assuming office January 1, 1968, because of budget considerations.

On February 1, 1968, the association opened offices at 926 Exchange Bank Tower with two executives and one secretary. This marked the beginning of the functional office of the association.

THE SEARCH FOR QUALITY AND THE PURSUIT OF EXCELLENCE: WHY THE ASSOCIATION WAS ORGANIZED

The underlying reason for the establishment of the association, while not specifically stated as such, was the search for quality and the pursuit of excellence.

For over 50 years these institutions had managed to survive and meet basic needs from funds derived from student fees, tuition, church donations, and other sources. However, the ingredients for quality education and for funds to provide a margin of academic excellence, together with the pressures for continued growth and expansion, called for a substantial increase in financial support. The success of Bishop College had shown that a single institution with a long-range program based on vision and purpose could attract widespread support from foundations, corporations and philanthropic individuals. Experience with the United Negro College

Fund had provided evidence of the added strength and benefits that come through joint effort.

The enlightened leadership of the participating colleges had come to realize that cooperative arrangements between institutions provide a more economical and efficient means for strengthening and broadening higher educational opportunity.

Thus, as organizers and incorporators of the association, the presidents of the participating colleges rejected the philosophy that financial impoverishment appeared to doom the colleges to mediocrity. They realized that with dedicated leadership, increased individual philanthropic and corporate support, more alumni-giving, larger foundation grants, government assistance and augmented fees, the colleges could succeed in providing quality higher education and a margin of excellence more nearly adequate to meet the demands of the times and the needs of their students.

The major goal set forth for the association is: "To carry out worthwhile cooperative programs for the improvement and development of the participating colleges." However, it is evident from the charter that the role and scope of the association and its program is comprehensive in nature.

Article Four of the charter contains the following statement of purposes:

1. To carry out cooperative programs for the development and improvement of the participating colleges in such manner that the governing boards, the administration, the curricula, and all other aspects of autonomy of the respective participating colleges are maintained;
2. To cooperatively seek and receive gifts and grants of money from any and all legitimate sources amenable to the philosophy and purposes of the participating colleges;
3. To develop, maintain, operate and provide facilities and services for the advancement of higher education through its participating colleges;
4. To promote the exchange of faculty or students with participating colleges and other colleges and universities, including arrangements for bringing visiting scholars to participating colleges;
5. To promote faculty and administration improvement programs, utilizing training, education (including fellowships leading to advanced degrees), internships, research participation and other means;
6. To introduce new curricula and curricular materials;
7. To develop and operate cooperative education programs, including alternate periods of academic study and business or public employment;
8. To promote the joint use of facilities, such as libraries and laboratories, including necessary books, materials and equipment; and
9. To provide other arrangements which offer promise of strengthening the academic program and the administration of the participating colleges.

THE PROGRAM IN ACTION

The program is governed by an elected Board of Trustees consisting of 19 members. The board includes representatives of other higher educational institutions, public schools, churches, businesses, government, industry, and other educational associations. President J. O. Perpener of Jarvis Christian College is chairman of the Board of Trustees. President John T. King of Huston-Tillotson College is vice-chairman. The presidents of the participating colleges are delegate trustees and comprise the executive committees.

The charter and by-laws of the association made provisions for admitting other colleges as participating institutions, provided they meet the definition of a "developing institution." In addition, the by-laws provide that the board of trustees may be enlarged.

Funds for the operation of the association for a three year period (1967-70) are provided on a "matching basis" by a grant of $120,000 from the Ford Foundation and by fees assessed to six member colleges. The assessments to the colleges are based on the formula of 60 per cent equally and 40 per cent in

proportion to enrollment. The annual budget for operation of the association for 1968-69 was $80,000.

The staff of the association consists of W. B. Rogers, president; Carl F. Parker, vice president; Melvin B. Shaw, director of development; Rosie L. Perry, secretary to the president; Rosa C. Travis, office manager-fiscal clerk; and Doris A. Robertson, director of gifts, records and research.

The guiding spirit behind much of the association's organization and early efforts was Dr. Carl F. Parker, coordinator-consultant. It was he who formulated the philosophy of the association, its purposes, programs for action, fundamental guiding principles, problems which had to be faced, and a long range plan for the association.

The initial list of 27 projects prepared by the coordinator-consultant to be undertaken by the association was most comprehensive and inclusive. Eleven of the action programs were suggested for possible funding under Title III grants or by foundations. A comprehensive program proposal was submitted to a foundation for possible funding. The foundation refused not only to support the association's ambitious program, but turned down also two smaller proposals. It was the suggestion of the foundation that the association limit its initial efforts to one or two small programs which would be planned and administered by two staff persons and, that success with these small programs be built upon as a basis for future efforts.

The comprehensive program was made the priority of a Title III proposal to the United States Office of Education. For a number of reasons this proposal was not funded in 1967-68. After a careful review of the reasons why the funding of the first Title III proposal was not accomplished, a second comprehensive application was submitted to and approved by the United States Office of Education for 1968-69. The grant of $375,000 for 1968-69 was awarded to the association to support the following programs:

1. Visiting Scholars	$132,000
2. Telelecture Program	16,000
3. Establishment of development offices in the six colleges	90,000
4. Establishment of a development office for the association	44,500
5. Service Training of Administrators	15,000
6. Planning and Administration	32,500
7. National Teaching Fellowships of Paul Quinn College and Wiley College	45,000
TOTAL	$375,000

Bishop College served as the coordinating institution for the grant. It took the association somewhat longer than was anticipated to achieve the goal of a fully operative collegiate consortium. However, as a result of the Title III grant, the association now conducts a wide range of programs and activities designed to strengthen and improve the six participating colleges.

The establishment and operation of development offices in each of the six participating colleges received top priority on the part of the colleges and the association. With the exception of Bishop College, none of the six colleges had a person with either the title or the assignment of a development officer. The association's program has now put a development officer in each college, and through monthly seminars provision has been made for training, counsel and the necessary coordination of their efforts.

Along with the establishment and operation of developmental programs in each of the six participating colleges a development office for the association has also been established. A full scale fund-raising campaign for $500,000 has been launched by the development office of the association to secure scholarship funds for students enrolled in the six participating colleges. Extensive use is being made of television and radio and attractive brochures to explain the needs of the colleges and to promote the scholarship program.

A full complement of two visiting scholars for each institution has been filled. The visiting scholars participate in faculty workshops, curriculum development projects, institutional self-studies, and other programs. They are engaged in curriculum revision programs in science, mathematics and other academic subjects. They serve as lecturers in the fields of Negro culture, history, literature, drama, art, music, politics and government. The association plays no direct role in the employment of these teachers. Its role has been limited to providing uniform guidelines for the program, to certifying the filling of the positions to the U. S. Office of Education and to channeling the necessary funds to the institutions.

An inservice program for the improvement of administrative personnel has been initiated by the association. The objective of this cooperative program is the attainment of maximum effectiveness, greater efficiency, and economy of operation in the colleges. The grant for this program provides funds for workshops, seminars, visits by consultants, and trips by personnel in the six colleges to visit other institutions. This includes members of the college administrative staffs and members of the boards of trustees.

The program was inaugurated by a seminar on Intra-Campus Communication for development officers. The purpose of the three day seminar (in July, 1968) was to provide the opportunity and climate for the informal exchange of ideas and institutional introspective analysis and comparison. Other seminars are planned for the presidents, academic deans, business managers, student personnel officers and members of the boards of trustees of the colleges. Plans have been completed for the beginning of a telelecture program during the second semester of the 1968-69 academic year. Telelecture program equipment has been purchased and is being installed at each of the six colleges. Studies are underway, also, of the possibilities for developing computer operations for the computerization of information, data gathering and processing, and the standardization of information procedures for the six colleges.

The association has received a grant of $40,550 from the Ford Foundation to improve the competency and the performance of student financial aid administrators in 20 selected predominantly Negro colleges in Alabama and Louisiana. The program was originated by the College Entrance Examination Board and the association is sponsoring and administering it. The first of three workshops was held in Dallas in November, 1968. A second workshop was held in Birmingham in February, 1969, and a third in Dallas during April, 1969.

Another grant by the Ford Foundation has enabled the association, in cooperation with Michigan State University, to sponsor the MEMO (More Education More Opportunity) program for Texas which records and codifies college plans (or lack of them) and related information on every Negro high school senior in the state. This detailed information (with name, address, grade standing, college preference, etc.) will be made available first to the six colleges and later to all colleges and universities in Texas.

Momentum has built up for other major common efforts to strengthen the institutions by cooperative means and bring additional resources to the institutions through several channels. A foundation has indicated its readiness to receive a proposal for a Consortium Admissions Program. A plan is in preparation which will incorporate, among other features, the use of the MEMO program, a testing and guidance center and a recruitment program which will concentrate upon the large number of Negro high school graduates who should be in college and have no such plans or opportunities. Another foundation has expressed interest in a program relating to the coordination of the religious activities of the six campuses, with special emphasis upon student attitudes—religious, social and activist.

As a result of becoming acquainted with the existence and purposes of the association, a $10,000 grant has been received from the U. S. Steel Foundation for general support.

A proposal to the U. S. Office of Education for a grant under Title 5E of the Education Professions Development Act has been funded in the amount of $20,000 for a project designed to review the pattern of governance of the six colleges.

The association has noted with considerable interest the televised classroom program of TAGER (The Association for Graduate Education and Research of North Texas) and the possible use of closed-circuit television among and between the colleges. Future program activities of the association are indicated best perhaps by a summary of the funding request for 1969-70:

Program Category	Total
1. Curriculum Development	$ 62,500
2. Faculty Development	129,650
3. Administrative Improvement	424,050
4. Student Services Improvement	295,250
TOTAL	$911,450

A COOPERATIVE APPRAISAL

There can be no doubt that the Texas Association of Developing Colleges has been a pronounced success as an experiment in cooperation.

The association is now a fully operative collegiate consortium with significant programs and with a wide range of other programs in the proposal and planning stages. It has a multi-source financial base and wide acceptance, and recognition as a prototype consortium.

The United Board for College Development, located in Atlanta, has conducted a study of libraries in an association of Alabama colleges, looking toward common purchasing and processing of all library books at considerable savings. It has proposed a similar center for the Texas Assocation, based on its findings in Alabama. The Alabama consortium is composed of both public and private institutions. It is funded by the Ford Foundation and a Title III grant from the U. S. Office of Education. Its headquarters are located in Birmingham, and its staff is currently engaged in developing policies and possible programs to be undertaken by the consortium.

The Mississippi Association of Developing Colleges is a consortium of seven private four-year and junior colleges. It is funded by a Ford Foundation grant of approximately $20,000. At the present time its executive offices are located at Mary Holmes College. The Mississippi Association is a "modified version" of the Texas Association both in organization and proposed program development.

The Triangle Association of Colleges is composed of five private church related colleges in South Carolina, and Paine College in Augusta, Georgia. It is organized but not yet funded and staffed. Much of the stimulation for the organization of the Triangle Association has come from the United Board for College Development which played a significant role in the organization and development of the Texas Association.

Not only has the association served as a prototype for the organization and development of other consortia, it has also stimulated various programs of interaction and mutual helpfulness both among the six participating colleges and the other institutions of higher education in the state. While each of the colleges participates equally in the program, two of the colleges—because of their unaccredited status—have received considerable assistance from the other colleges and more attention and staff service from the association.

One of the most successful features of the Texas Association is its organizational and administrative structure. Its minimal structure proposes to be sufficient only to plan and implement necessary coop-

erative programs. The association is extremely flexible in regard to its program undertakings, its management, its financing, and other features.

The participating institutions understand that the association does not propose to tell them what to do. While they expect their representatives to engage fully and freely in all discussions, programs, and activities, their affiliation in no way restricts their independence of judgement and action. Each institution is free to guide its own destiny. Each participating college has a strong voice in the policy decisions, programs and activities of the association. Steps are taken to insure that there is no overlap between the programs included in the applications of the association and the proposals of the individual institutions. Furthermore, there is a strong commitment by the personnel of the six colleges to support those cooperative programs being developed by the association.

The institutions have demonstrated their faith in the association, as evidenced by their interest and involvement in the development of its policies and programs. All of the participating institutions send representatives to a monthly meeting, as well as other called meetings. Faculty and staff members serve on various committees of the association.

A second significant feature of the association is that it is chartered as a perpetual corporation. It will have a continuous life regardless of the deaths of its trustees or the misfortunes which may befall the participating colleges, or of any number of partial or entire changes, substitutions or replacements of trustees or participating colleges.

A third highlight of the association has been the gratifying readiness of the institutions to share in the new enterprise, and the great willingness of people to change. The value of the association as a change agent is illustrated best perhaps by what it has accomplished on an institutional basis. It has helped the colleges in their search for new ways of getting more and better financing of educational facilities and programs, and more effectively utilizing those which they have already. It has provided the climate and opportunity for them to examine in depth their problems and assess their strength and needs in an endeavor to discover ways and means by which they might, through cooperative action, become stronger as individual institutions. Suspicions have been alleviated, mutual understanding and respect increased, words and ideas once anathema now are discussed openly and freely. A heartening sense of unity has been promoted; and an interest in and an understanding of each institution's purposes and practices have been enhanced.

The association is fulfilling well its role as an agent of change. Its leadership has been alert to innovation, and has taken the initiative in planning programs focused upon ideas and actions needed to build more effective programs relevant to the social, economic and cultural changes taking place in the South. The association is doing much to change the outlook of the participating colleges enrolling predominantly Negro student bodies, for they are not interested in looking backwards. They are instead looking to the future with confidence, discussing issues and planning innovative programs to meet the challenges they face.

Program operations cannot bypass the necessary personnel required to implement them. In some cases future programs can be built upon existing personnel in the institutions. In other cases future programs can only be implemented by adding personnel to coordinate, develop, or administer them. The future staff needs of the association must be assessed and projected.

Careful attention should be given to the committee structure and organization of the association. The Program Planning Committee and such other committees and subcommittees as may be constituted to undertake projects on behalf of the association

should be provided with clear statements of their roles and responsibilities.

There is great need to involve fully and to a greater degree the tremendous amount of faculty talent available in the participating institutions. A program to increase faculty and student knowledge of the association should be undertaken.

The future of the association appears to be limited only by the imagination, commitment to common tasks and the continued vision of its leadership. If there is nothing so powerful as an idea whose time has come, the association has power because, obviously, the time has come for the idea of a consortium. For many traditionally Negro colleges, cooperative arrangements will be essential for foundation and government funding of program development and expansion, and—in some cases—survival.

It is to be hoped that the original expectations for cooperative activities between the six colleges in the association and traditionally white colleges and universities in the same region may soon be realized. A significant start has been made, and a rich potential remains to be explored.

THE LEMOYNE-OWEN MERGER

by J. S. Anzalone

The opening of LeMoyne-Owen College in September, 1968, serves as a viable example of how institutions, with adequate planning within a spirit of innovation, can work together cooperatively and constructively while utilizing methods which recognize student, faculty, administrative, and governing differences.

LeMoyne, operating through the church-related heritage of the American Missionary Association with an independent board of trustees, was founded in 1870 and chartered as a college in 1934. Owen College was chartered as a junior college in 1954 under the auspices of the Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention and operated with an open-door admission policy. LeMoyne was nonresidential; Owen offered dormitory facilities.

Enrollment at Owen and LeMoyne colleges had been affected by the availability of public higher education opportunities in the Memphis area in recent years. The spiraling cost of providing private college facilities and services had greatly affected the development of long-range plans for Owen College since the institution had no endowment and was operating on a year-to-year financial basis. The plight of private higher education in the Memphis area was recognized by the two college presidents. At a conference sponsored by the Central Midwestern Regional Education Laboratory held in Memphis in November, 1966, the presidents of LeMoyne and Owen informally broached the idea of a possible merger of the institutions.

On November 23, President Charles L. Dinkins of Owen College suggested the possibility of preliminary discussions relating to a merger to the executive committee of the Owen board of trustees. He was authorized to pursue his discussion with President Hollis F. Price of LeMoyne College. Trustees of both institutions were contacted by the presidents and it became obvious that board interest was inclined toward exploring the potentials of a merger. The two colleges were joining forces in applying for federal assistance for developing institutions, and dialogue was accelerated.

On January 11, 1967, a fire destroyed the main auxiliary building at Owen College. This loss emphasized the need to plan properly for the future utilization of the financial resources available to the institution. It became necessary for the Owen board to prepare recommendations on the future of the institution for presentation at the February 22 meeting of the Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention. On January 25 the Owen College board authorized a select committee to meet with a similar group of LeMoyne College trustees to initiate interinstitutional governing board dialogue on February 4, 1967.

The committees of the boards met with the presidents at LeMoyne College to explore the possible avenues of cooperation, coordination, and/or merger. It was emphasized that the approach needed to take into consideration the interest of higher education in the locale and the problems the institutions faced relating to finances, facilities, and accreditation. A matter of prime concern to the Owen representatives was the continuation of the "Owen image" and the impact possible merger would have on the Baptist constituency in Tennessee. The ap-

proval of the convention was a necessary step before a merger might be realized.

Several problem areas were identified early in the discussions. LeMoyne College enjoyed a long tradition as a "church related" institution, the definition of which the LeMoyne board committee members wanted understood by all parties concerned. LeMoyne was governed by an independent, self-perpetuating board of trustees that held all authority for operating the institution. The Owen board had been elected by the convention and board members viewed their responsibilities as subject to the will of the convention. The basic issue on this point was the degree of independence for governance exercised by the respective boards.

The matter of trustees representative of the Baptist constituency of Owen College provided another subject for discussion and negotiation. The parties involved felt that the convention should have an opportunity to name several members to a new board of trustees should the institutions be consolidated.

The financial implications of the merger occupied a considerable amount of time of the joint committees. Although Owen College did not have an endowment, it did possess real property assets, equipment, library holdings, the proceeds from insurance coverage on the building lost by fire, and monetary support subscribed by the Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention. An important financial aspect, too, was the matter of federal grants derived through the National Defense Education Act and other legislation.

In the event a merger was realized, it was felt that Owen faculty members with tenure would be needed by the new institution because of projected enrollment increases. Owen College had experienced a somewhat high faculty turnover, and it was anticipated that the number of faculty involved in the transition would be small. Non-teaching members of the staff might possibly be offered employment at the merged institution or assisted in finding suitable employment elsewhere. The president of Owen had earlier indicated that he would not be a candidate for the presidency of the new institution.

It was determined that the Owen students who had graduated and those who would be entering the sophomore year would be eligible to enter the new institution.

The merger committee met again on February 10, 1967, to continue discussion. The Owen trustees offered the following proposals:

1. All funds remaining from the insurance settlement after payment of Owen College debts would be turned over to LeMoyne.
2. The convention would be asked to develop a financial support program which would produce $20,000 to $30,000 annually for the merged institution.
3. Owen assets (educational equipment, library holdings, furnishings, etc.) which would be useful to the new institution would be transferred.
4. An appropriate building, to be named Owen College or Owen Hall, would be erected on the LeMoyne campus. This building would contain some suitable monument or plaque on which would be recorded an historical commentary of Owen College.
5. The new, merged institution would provide for a certain number of spaces on its board of trustees for individuals representative of the constituency of the Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention.
6. The merged institution would provide the convention the opportunity to perpetuate a lecture series with the campus providing the facilities and the convention providing the operational funds.
7. The merged institution would offer admission to as many qualified Owen College students as facilities would permit and would offer employment to Owen faculty members who have gained tenure and whose educational and professional qualifications are needed.

The Owen College trustees also announced their intention of proposing to the convention that title to the Owen campus and buildings be transferred to a new, non-profit corporation (to be known as the Baptist Educational Fund) established for educational and community improvement purposes. One of the

missions of the fund would be to raise and allocate monies for appropriate educational projects in the state of Tennessee.

The LeMoyne representatives on the merger committee endorsed the Owen proposals. The Owen board indicated that a merger proposal would be presented to the Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention on February 22, 1967.

President C. L. Dinkins presented a report on the future of Owen College at the board meeting held on February 17, 1967. This report was to provide the background for the recommendation to the Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention. The Reverend B. L. Hooks, chairman of the board, reported the discussions held with representatives of the LeMoyne board and joined with President Dinkins and the Rev. W. C. Holmes, another Owen board member, in accepting responsibility for presenting the merger recommendation to the convention.

On February 22, 1967, the convention approved the recommendation of the board of trustees that Owen College be merged with LeMoyne College. A memorandum to the faculty, staff, and students of Owen College from President Dinkins was issued on the same date (Appendix A). The memorandum announced convention approval of the merger and revealed that a meeting of the faculty and staff would be held on March 1 and a student assembly on March 3.

During the next several weeks discussions relating to details of the merger continued between the presidents of the institutions and at board meetings. The students at Owen were asked to respond to a questionnaire seeking information on the number of students who might continue their studies in the merged institution. The United States Office of Education was asked to authorize expenditure of Title III funds awarded to Owen College through the Higher Education Act of 1965 for the purpose of financing feasibility studies related to the planned merger. During this period of time an item of concern to the Owen board was the review of 1967-1968 budgets predicated on merger taking place in either 1967 or 1968.

On April 29, 1967, the LeMoyne trustees offered a statement to the Owen board reflecting the philosophy of LeMoyne College and the meaning of merger within the context of this philosophy (Appendix B). LeMoyne proposed that 1967-1968 be an academic year of coordination between the two institutions with merger to be accomplished by September, 1968. By early May, it became apparent that hopes to effect the merger by September, 1967, would be laid aside.

Opposition to the merger came from some Owen students who planned demonstrations as soon as merger plans were released. Classes were disrupted on the Owen campus on May 5 as approximately 200 students protested the idea of a merger and pledged to raise funds for Owen College. President Dinkins met with the demonstrating students before they returned to classes and announced later that student leaders had offered to support a drive for funds scheduled during May and June. (The Owen faculty had petitioned the board to postpone consolidation.) Public support for the proposed merger, moreover, was quick in coming. The public media responded with statements commending the plans and the rationale for merger (Appendix C).

The joint committee of the boards met on May 24, 1967, and accepted the action taken by the LeMoyne board on April 29, 1967, as the general agreement to a merger on the part of LeMoyne College. The May 24 meeting also produced an agreement that the Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention would have the privilege of nominating three members to serve on the governing board of the merged institution. On May 30 the chairman of the Owen board and the president of the convention asked the members of the Owen board to ratify by

ballot that an agreement in principle to the merger had been reached. This action was accomplished and led to the development of plans for the "Year of Coordination" with President Price and President Dinkins responsible for coordinating detailed plans at their respective colleges.

Guiding principles for coordinated efforts included the following:

1. The colleges would maintain their institutional identities during the 1967-68 academic year.
2. LeMoyne College and Owen College would share personnel, facilities, and public relations development to the extent possible, and coordinate institutional activities and programs.
3. The three trustees nominated by the convention would attend the meetings of the Board of Trustees of Le Moyne College during 1967-68 as observers. These individuals would become members of the board when the merger became official.
4. Review of developing merger plans would be made by the committees of the Owen and LeMoyne boards of trustees.

Activities projected for the 1967-1968 year included:

1. The development of a 10-year master plan for the consolidated institution with detailed consideration of plans extending to 1971.
2. An assessment of the faculty and staff needs of the merged institution with particular attention to a determination (by December 31, 1967) of which Owen College faculty members will be needed by the new college.
3. The establishment of counseling services for Owen College students related to transfer possibilities to other institutions and/or to acceptance by the merged institution.
4. A study of the curricula in business administration and secretarial science at Owen College in order to insure the continuation of these academic programs.
5. Establishment of student access to activity programs at either institution through mutual recognition of student identification cards.
6. Interinstitutional student participation in cultural activities, lecture series, and special educational programs facilitated by an exchange of institutional calendars.
7. Designation of the Owen College library administratively as a branch of the LeMoyne library in order that an evaluation of Owen library holdings, equipment and furnishings might be facilitated.
8. The development of approaches to possible financial support sources on the basis of program needs of the merged institution.
9. Obtaining of appropriate approval of federal agencies for audit and review of federal programs at Owen College with respect to responsibilities to be assumed when the merger is effected.
10. Cooperation in financial administration in order that the financial resources of Owen College may be examined with respect to the needs of the new institution.
11. Budget development for the 1968-1969 year of the merged institution with review and approval of the respective boards prior to May 1, 1968.
12. Development of an understanding of the Memphis region's potential for financial support of the merged institution and institutional planning for fund-raising.
13. Establishment of a legal basis to insure that any and all bequests made or to be made in favor of Owen College shall be directed to the new institution.
14. Development of program planning leading to the utilization of facilities by Baptist groups or other organizations as an appropriate public service function of the merged college.
15. An analysis of the continuing education responsibilities to the community by the merged institution.

The two colleges opened the "Year of Coordination" with increased enrollments and additional faculty. Arrangements were made with the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for an administrative review of accreditation matters related to the merger of the institutions. A grant of $10,000 from the United States Office of Education for cooperative planning was utilized to finance the details of merger planning.

Administrative staff coordination was well underway early in the 1967-1968 academic year. The

Owen student financial aid officer began working on the LeMoyne campus. General supervision of the Owen library was provided by the LeMoyne librarian. The LeMoyne public relations officer began handling all Owen publicity releases. Faculty exchanges were established and an Owen staff member began to work in the LeMoyne student center to coordinate student activities.

Continuing dialogue was held during the year on the availability and instructional capabilities of the Owen faculty regarding employment at the merged institution. Comprehensive counseling services were afforded to Owen students in order to facilitate their acceptance into the merged college or transfer to other institutions. Students contemplating study in the merged institution were asked to apply for admission by May 1, 1968. Although tuition and other fees would be higher for 1968-69, students were informed that Owen and LeMoyne colleges had consolidated their budgets for scholarships and other forms of financial aid and such assistance should be available to those qualified.

On February 20, 1968, the Owen board formally approved an agreement that the two institutions merge effective September 1, 1968, and that the new institution be named LeMoyne - Owen College. This action was immediately ratified by the convention. In general, the agreement included the following points:

1. The cash balance of proceeds received from the insurance settlement on the Owen property, land, buildings, educational equipment, and other assets be granted to the merged institution.
2. The Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention was to nominate three trustees to the institution's governing board.
3. Uninterrupted employment was to be offered to Owen faculty members who held tenure.
4. Students who would have been eligible to return to Owen (if it were operated separately) would be eligible for admission to the merged college.
5. The Owen College charter would be surrendered.
6. The LeMoyne College charter would be amended to reflect the change in institutional status.

On February 26, 1968, President Price of LeMoyne met with his administrative staff to discuss several details of planning related to the September 1 merger. Matters considered included: the acceptance of Owen credits in courses not offered at LeMoyne; the status of students on academic probation; classroom space requirements; admission deadline date; student financial aid potential; the transfer of Owen student academic records to the LeMoyne campus; and the consolidation of the faculties. President Price appointed committees to facilitate student transfer, financial aid decisions, library resources, and the transfer of Owen student and alumni records.

Close liaison with the higher education section of the U. S. Office of Education Atlanta staff facilitated the planning of the merged accounts representing federal funds granted to the two institutions. Auditing was required, as was the execution of an agreement form for financial accountability.

Plans relating to the merger of the respective alumni associations were emphasized in June when the first effort between the executive officers of the associations was realized. During the same month the administration building on the Owen campus was leased to the Memphis Board of Education for use as a Community Learning Laboratory.

By the end of July, the necessary signatures relating to financial and legal requirements were obtained in order to finalize the merger agreement. The official agreement (without attachments) is presented here (Appendix D).

The problems encountered by the individuals who worked diligently in first exploring the possibility of a merger of the two institutions and then to make the consolidation a reality were real and difficult to solve. The areas which required specific attention

and cooperative decisions included:

1. The establishment of mutual understanding of the opportunities and benefits which would accrue from a merger of the institutions.
2. A realization of the uniquenesses of the respective institutions and the need to preserve such uniqueness in the merged college.
3. An understanding of the clientele and publics of the two institutions.
4. The solicitation of public, alumni, student, and faculty advice and assistance.
5. The financial implications (student and institutional) inherent to the consolidation process.
6. The necessity for establishing long-range academic and facility planning appropriate to the mission and goals of the church-related college.
7. The transfer eligibility (academic standing and course credits) of students.
8. The recognition of service of tenured faculty and the appropriateness of their academic specialties at the consolidated college.
9. The utilization of administrative staff talent.
10. The preservation of traditions and heritage through appropriate governing board alignment.

Solutions were found, however, which encouraged a continuing dialogue and a realization that none of the problems was insurmountable. The close cooperation between the two presidents, the committees of the respective boards, and later between numerous staff and faculty members at Owen and LeMoyne made the merger a reality.

APPENDIX A

Owen College

Memphis, Tennessee

MEMORANDUM TO: Faculty, Staff, and Students
Owen College

FROM: President Charles L. Dinkins

DATE: February 22, 1967

On today the Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention, which is the sponsoring church organization for Owen College, voted the authority to the Board of Trustees of Owen College to work with the Board of Trustees of LeMoyne College in order to merge these institutions. This authority is given, subject to agreements to this effect being made by the two Boards of Trustees.

The details of the merger, and the date when the merger will take effect are yet to be developed. You will be kept informed. At the time the merger becomes effective, however, any Owen College student who is eligible to re-enter Owen College will be automatically admitted to LeMoyne. Special consideration is also being given to the merger of faculty, administrative, and ancillary personnel.

This action by the Convention was taken in the effort to place the resources and traditions of these two institutions together in order to develop a strong institution of quality for the benefit of the students. Consideration was given to the great changes that have taken place in American education in the past ten to fifteen years, especially: (1) the emphasis on quality in education, especially in the scientific and technological fields, and the resulting emphasis on quality in the humanities and social sciences; (2) the civil rights revolution and all of its ramifications; and (3) the influence of government, foundations, business, and industry, in determining the course of American education as these become the principal sources of revenue to meet the sky-rocketing costs of education. Consideration was also given to the rising influence of public community colleges and technical institutes, the nature of "church-relation" as distinct from "church-control," and the demands and requirements for accreditation.

For the remainder of this school year you will not notice any appreciable change in Owen College, except as the administrations of the two Colleges work together to iron out the details of merger, subject to the approval of the respective Boards of Trustees.

In order that you may be informed as to the significance of this step, and what it means for the two Colleges, there will be a meeting of the faculty and staff of Owen College on Wednesday, March 1, and a special student assembly on Friday, March 3.

APPENDIX B

A Statement from the LeMoyne College Board of Trustees Regarding the Proposed Merger of LeMoyne and Owen Colleges

LeMoyne College is a church-founded and sponsored liberal arts college, deriving its inspiration from the Judeo-Christian heritage. It operates autonomously under its independent Board of Trustees. In the service of its predominantly Negro constituency, it offers a place for education of the qualified and serious student in an atmosphere of free exchange of ideas. To the extent that merger of Le Moyne College and Owen College will strengthen the type of operation and education to which LeMoyne is committed and will benefit the community as a whole, the Trustees of LeMoyne favor such action:

I. The merger should enhance the effectiveness of the merged institution in its total educational function by:
   A. Increasing the financial resources of the merged institution.
   B. Helping the merged college to maintain and raise the academic level of the student body.
   C. Increasing and improving the faculty of the merged college.

II. The merged college must retain the freedom and integrity of the Board of Trustees to determine the policies and guide the administration of the merged college. This would not preclude the privilege of receiving nominations from the constituency of Owen College.

III. The merged institution should seek in all ways appropriate to an institution of higher education, to be useful to its entire church constituency and to cultivate mutually helpful relationships, with the understanding that the college is not the instrument of the church's organizational purposes, but rather is its respected equal in its own mission to society.

April 29, 1967

APPENDIX C

Owen College's Merger Need

Owen College has a proud if youthful heritage, having grown from the humble beginning of 33 students in 1954 to its present 383 enrollment. But the two-year college is hurting economically, and the proposal that it merge with LeMoyne College makes sense.

Those who protest against the merger fail to recognize several blunt facts of life: To survive independently Owen needs Federal and foundation grants. It cannot expect to continue to receive the help it has in the past, primarily because of its close affiliation with the Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention. LeMoyne, affiliated with the United Church of Christ, may also face obstacles in receiving grants because of close church connection. Together, they would be able to maintain religious connections but without the disadvantage of church control.

Moreover, there is the specter of competition from Memphis State University and a future state-supported two-year college. Tuition at the state junior college can be expected to be considerably less than at Owen, even though Owen faculty members now receive less on the average than teachers in the public school system.

Vocational and technical schools also are competing for the kind of student Owen has attracted.

Unless it could foresee phenomenal growth, broad Federal and foundation financial support, and higher teacher standards and pay, Owen would simply fade away under economic and social pressures. Its administration, rather than submit to such a demise, wants to maintain something of the Owen identity and heritage, and continue to make a place for the students to whom it has appealed. Thus the attraction to the idea of merger with LeMoyne.

We regret that the dream that was brought to fruition in the founding of Owen College should come to this rude awakening. It would be nice if the difficulties could be worked out without merger. But there is no such prospect in the cold light of today's dawn.

Such a merger, which would not become final for many months at any rate, appears the best solution for the problems which beset Owen College, and the effort to effect this solution is an honest one.

Editorial in the *Memphis Commercial Appeal,* May 8, 1967.

APPENDIX D

LeMoyne-Owen College Merger Agreement

LeMOYNE COLLEGE ("LeMoyne") and OWEN COLLEGE ("Owen"), members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, are predominantly Negro colleges located in Memphis, Tennessee. LeMoyne was founded in 1870 by The American Missionary Association, was chartered as a college in 1934 and offers a four-year degree program in the liberal arts and sciences, accommodating approximately 650 students. Owen, a two-year college, featuring general education, with an enrollment of approximately 375, was chartered in 1954 as S. A. Owen Junior College; since 1957 it has operated under its present name. It is sponsored by, and has close ties with, the Tennessee Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention ("the Convention").

Owen, with the approval of the Convention which enters into this Agreement for the purposes expressed, and LeMoyne agree that:

I.

Underlying Principles

The Colleges and the Convention subscribe to the following statement of principles adopted by the Board of Trustees of LeMoyne at its April 1967 meeting:

"LeMoyne is a church-founded and sponsored liberal arts college, deriving its inspiration from the Judeo-Christian heritage. It operates autonomously under its independent Board of Trustees. In the service of its predominantly Negro constituency, it offers a place for education of the qualified and serious student in an atmosphere of free exchange of ideas. To the extent that merger of LeMoyne and Owen will strengthen the type of operation and education to which LeMoyne is committed and will benefit the community as a whole, the Trustees of LeMoyne favor such action.

The merger should enhance the effectiveness of the merged institution in its total educational function by:

Increasing the financial resources of the merged institution;

Helping the merged college to maintain and raise the academic level of the student body; and

Increasing and improving the faculty of the merged college.

The merged college must retain the freedom and integrity of the Board of Trustees to determine its policies and guide its administration. This would not preclude the privilege of receiving nominations from the constituency of Owen.

The merged institution should seek in all ways appropriate to an institution of higher education, to be useful to its entire church constituency and to cultivate mutually helpful relationships, with the understanding that the college is not the instrument of the church's organizational purposes, but rather is its respected equal in its own mission to society."

II.

Coordination

The academic year 1967-1968 has been a year of coordination between the Colleges, in accord with the principles and embracing the activities stated in the May 1967 document styled "Details of 'Year of Coordination'—1967-1968" jointly subscribed by the Presidents of the Colleges who will have administrative responsibility for such coordination. Such document is incorporated herein by reference.

III.

Merger

The Colleges, pursuant to this Agreement, will merge effective September 1, 1968.

IV.

Name

LeMoyne, into which Owen shall merge, will change its name to LeMoyne-Owen College ("LeMoyne-Owen"), to be effective as soon as conveniently possible after compliance by Owen with the provisions of paragraph V below, which call for performance on or before September 1, 1968.

V.

Property of Owen

Owen will transfer and deliver to LeMoyne, as provided herein, all of its net assets.

Following the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not later than August 1, 1968, Owen will transfer and deliver to LeMoyne its usable educational equipment, inventories, accounts receivable, principal of scholarship and loan funds and other usable tangible assets, other than real estate, as reflected on the Balance Sheet of Owen as of such date.

LeMoyne will maintain the official student educational (academic) and financial (accounts receivable) records of Owen, and will accept the assets and liabilities of the Owen College National Defense Student Loan Fund at the conclusion of the audit year ending June 30, 1968, provided the transfer of the National Defense Student Loan Fund is approved by federal authorities.

On or before September 1, 1968, Owen will contribute to LeMoyne the sum of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($150,000) cash, currently on deposit in Tri-State Bank of Memphis and represented by certificates of deposit.

On or before September 1, 1968, Owen will deliver validly executed warranty deed conveying to LeMoyne unencumbered fee simple title to all land and buildings of Owen, including, without limitation, the real estate described on Attachment A made a part hereof.

On or before January 1, 1969, Owen will transfer and deliver to LeMoyne-Owen all of the balance of its cash and personal property, after deduction only for payments in satisfaction of the indebtedness of Owen and of the Convention on behalf of Owen, arising out of operation of Owen, including payments in satisfaction of the mortgage indebtedness against the real estate of Owen and the net deficit, after all receipts, of Owen through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, as per audit by accountants satisfactory to LeMoyne.

LeMoyne assumes no liability of Owen not specifically described in this Agreement.

VI.

Annual Support of LeMoyne-Owen

The Convention will contribute to the support of LeMoyne-Owen the annual sum of not less than $25,000 which, for the academic year 1968-1969, is unconditionally guaranteed by the Convention.

Such contribution will be from sources not presently available to LeMoyne, including donations from the Convention and affiliated associations and churches and from special projects and efforts.

VII.

Students

Subject to procedures developed at the administrative level in cooperation with Owen, LeMoyne-Owen will admit in the fall of 1968 such former Owen students as shall be mutually agreed upon. Record keeping and credit procedures for former students of Owen shall be as described on Attachment B made a part hereof.

VIII.

Faculty and Staff

Subject to procedures developed at the administrative level in cooperation with Owen, LeMoyne will offer uninterrupted employment to all present members of the Owen faculty with tenure and to such other members of the faculty and such staff personnel as may be selected by Le Moyne. Retirement benefits will be made available to the maximum limits permitted by existing plans.

IX.

Use of Facilities

Consistent with the above statement of underlying principles, and subject to availability as determined at the administrative level, LeMoyne-Owen will provide the Convention with physical facilities to house some of the Baptist activities, such as City and State Congresses, Youth Encampment and the like, including a Lecture Series for perpetuating the Roger Williams-Howe image; the Convention will pay the reasonable expenses of such use and programs. LeMoyne-Owen will permit the Convention to place on its campus suitable commemorative plaques approved by LeMoyne-Owen as to design and placement, including one giving the history of Owen College.

X.

Bequests

It is contemplated that Owen will surrender its Charter; Owen, for itself, its Trustees in dissolution and successors, transfers and assigns, and agrees to pay and deliver, to LeMoyne-Owen any bequest to Owen for educational purposes received or receivable after the effective date of the merger, and further agrees that LeMoyne-Owen is and may be regarded as its educational successor to receive any such bequest.

XI.

Nomination to Board of Trustees of LeMoyne-Owen

As long as there is full compliance with this Agreement,

the Convention shall have the privilege of nominating three members for election by the Board of Trustees of LeMoyne-Owen to such Board to the end that three members so elected shall serve at all times. Such nominations and elections initially shall be for terms of one, two and three years, respectively, and thereafter for terms of three years.

Executed at Memphis Tennessee, as of May 24, 1968, the signatories being duly authorized by appropriate action of their respective governing bodies.

LeMOYNE COLLEGE

By /s/ E. Dalstrom
Chairman of the Board

Attest:

/s/ Theodore R. McLemore
Secretary

/s/ Hollis F. Price
President

OWEN COLLEGE

By /s/ B. L. Hooks
Chairman of the Board

Attest:

/s/ F. Ardella Owen
Secretary

/s/ Charles L. Dinkins
President

TENNESSEE BAPTIST MISSIONARY AND EDUCATIONAL CONVENTION, INC.

By /s/ A. McEwen Williams
President

Attest:

/s/ W. H. Walker
Secretary